Project Charter

CJIS Information Exchange Project, Collections Data from Courts to County Attorneys

urlIntegration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Author(s)	Revision Notes
0.1	12/19/2012	J Pingel	Initial Draft
0.2	12/20/2012	E Green	Internal Review
1.0	12/21/2012	R Collins	Final QA Review

1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

County Attorneys in Iowa are authorized to begin a collections process once fines, fees or other court costs on a case become 90 days past due. Many County Attorneys across Iowa have a collection program in place, and most of them utilize their case management system (CMS). They rely on timely and complete information from the Iowa Courts' Information System (ICIS) to stay updated on which cases are eligible for collections, and the amounts collectable.

This exchange will send the collections and payments data from the ICIS court case management to a County Attorney's CMS. For the initial installation of this exchange, CJIS will partner with the Iowa Counties' Association, and the Iowa County Attorneys' Case Management Project. The endpoint for the first implementation of this exchange will be the ProLaw case management system. The exchange will monitor cases that are currently being collected by the County Attorney (CA) and new cases that will be assigned to the CA in the future. The case ID for every case in CA collections will reside in a listener table on the ICIS database. These case IDs will remain on the listener table until the collections on the case is complete.

Data-integration projects like this involve managers, line staff and information technology (IT) staff from multiple agencies. Several private-sector vendors are also typically involved. As a result, coordination at the outset of the project is essential. This document initiates that coordination. The purposes for this charter include:

- To level-set all project participants in terms of the basic objectives of the project;
- To begin the analysis of project feasibility;
- To identify general resource needs, and to establish target dates or time frames for devoting the needed resources to the project;
- To understand and discuss the interdependencies between the partner agencies and their vendors.

2.0 PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In 2012 URL Integration worked with Polk County's IT and Sheriff Departments to create an exchange that provided both Disposition and Payment information for Polk County court cases. Polk County staff wrote the data to a local database, which they use to manage dispositions and payments internally.

In the course of that project, URL created the components at the courts' ICIS system and the CJIS Program's Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) that can be adapted to provide collections/payment data to any interested recipient. The services and data-integration required for a recipient –whether a county attorney or a state agency—will be part of the scope of this project.

A "Dispositions to County Attorneys" project was initiated by CJIS' prime contractor, URL Integration, in July 2012. This charter initiates the second "half" of this effort, providing collections data to other county attorneys.

Thus, the overall goal of the project is to build and deploy into production (for at least one recipient endpoint) a CJIS exchange that provides collections information.

The objectives necessary to meet that goal include:

1. Document the business requirements for maintaining collections data in a county attorney CMS.
2. Modify the Polk County Dispositions and Payments exchange that was developed in 2012 to accommodate a wider audience of recipient agencies/systems.
3. Re-use the web services and processing components built for the Polk County project to publish collections updates.
4. Create ICIS database triggers to publish collections and payment information from any Iowa county.
5. Develop ESB code for the Collections exchange.
6. Develop receiving web services to be used by county attorneys.
7. Develop the required data integration and processing components for county attorneys to consume collections data and process it as required.

3.0   STAKEHOLDERS

1. Iowa Judicial Branch – Office of the CIO
2. Iowa County Attorneys
3. Iowa County Attorneys Case Management Project (ICACMP)
4. Iowa CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Systems) Program

4.0   BENEFITS AND DELIVERABLES

1. The benefits of automated, near-real-time collections reporting include:
2. Improved timeliness in data exchange.
   a. Better collections rates, resulting in potential revenue increases for counties.
   b. Reduced cost in re-programming the interface when databases and applications change on either side.
3. Major Milestones
   a. Full documentation to include:
      i. Business requirements
      ii. NIEM-conformant IEPD (xml schemas, examples and documentation
      iii. A Solution Architecture, conformant with the US Department of Justice's Global Reference Architecture, which fully documents the secure web services communications between the systems.

    b. Components at the Courts:
        i. Event/listener table and triggers.
        ii. Java programming to bind records to xml.
        iii. Web services client.
    c. ProLaw Components:
        i. Web service client to receive xml messages from ESB.
        ii. Data integration to parse the xml and populate the Collections Tab in the application with updated data.
    d. ESB components:
        i. Send and receive web services and clients.
        ii. Security and encryption.

5.0   RISKS

1. Initially identified risks include:
    a. Availability of programming staff – aligning multiple team members' timelines versus other competing priorities.
    b. Unforeseen complexity in modifying Collections schemas or web services.
    c. Whether the data elements extracted from the courts' CA_Daily and CA_Weekly tables for the Polk County project are sufficient for processing by the receiving partners.
    d. The magnitude of programming changes required for endpoint systems to receive and match it to existing tables in fields.
    e. The timing of CJIS' migration from the existing ESB environment to an upgraded Oracle Service Bus (OSB) environment.
2. Risk Management Strategies
    a. At the outset, stakeholders and project managers from all agencies will review timelines and competing priorities, and identify the best timeline during Fiscal Year 2013 to begin and complete the required tasks, with minimal interruption.
    b. The project team will review the courts' data-entry practices in a county before selecting that county for implementation of this exchange.
    c. Scope will be managed by limiting the data to be exchanged to the data currently extracted for Polk County, **from the CA_Daily, CA_Weekly and related tables**.
    d. The URL Project Manager will maintain a project plan in Microsoft Project which will detail the dependencies among agencies. The plan will be adjusted to accommodate risks, unforeseen additional tasks, and delays.
3. Unidentified Risk Management
    a. Project managers from URL and the partner agencies and vendors will communicate with each other regularly, and clearly identify risks as soon as possible.
    b. Once the project is initiated, the project team will hold regular conference calls for project status updates. The team may agree on weekly or biweekly intervals for the

calls. The goal of each call will be a brief status update on all active tasks, a review of upcoming tasks and dependencies, and identification of project risks. In-depth work between two or more team members will be scheduled during the status meeting; however the main objective of the regular calls is issue identification. Resolution will be scheduled to be dealt with offline, in between meetings.

4. Project Dependencies
    a. Team member availability:
        i. Competing priorities for Courts-ICIS' development staff
        ii. Competing priorities for CA development staff
        iii. Competing priorities for URL staff
    b. Implementation of the State's new OSB environment.
5. Risk Mitigation Strategies
    a. Project planning at the outset, to identify dependencies among team members, as well as windows of opportunity for specific development tasks around other, external priorities.
    b. If the new OSB environment is not ready, the project team (primarily URL and CJIS) will have to decide whether to deploy to the existing ESB environment, or postpone deployment and testing milestones until the OSB environment is available.

6.0   ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Name	Organization	Role	Contact
Keith Kreiman	CJIS	CJIS Executive Sponsor	
Mark Headlee	Courts	Executive Sponsor	
Tim Gilchrist	Courts	Project Manager-Courts	
Teresa Smith	Story County Attorney's Office	Pilot implementation-site manager	
Zetta Pilch	Iowa County Attorneys' Case Management Project	Executive Sponsor-County Attorneys	
Jared Pedersen	URL PMO	Project Sponsor	

| Richard Lou | URL | Technical Lead | |
| Jim Pingel | URL | Project Manager | |

6.1   RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Name	Organization	Role	Tasks	Commitment (estimated)
Dave Schmitz/Ken Anderson	CJIS/URL	ESB Developer	ESB Services Testing	20 hours
Tim Gilchrist	Courts	Project Manager-Courts	Resource scheduling Court SME Testing	10 hours
Teresa Smith	County Attorney representative	Subject Matter Expert(s) – attorneys' use of disposition data	Data requirements – county attorneys	10 hours
Elena Letourneau	ICAMCP	Developer(s)/programmer(s)	Data integration for CA systems	TBD
Roxanne Shermann	URL	Technical Lead, Developer of web services for CA endpoints		60 hours
Robert Winchell	URL	Developer of Courts' services and		40 hours

		components		
Cheryle Stuhmer	URL	Business Analyst	Exchange requirements Documentation Testing	20 hours
Jim Pingel	URL	Project Manager		40 hours

7.0   COMMUNICATION

Communication Method	Distribution List	Timing of Communication
Status conference calls	Core project team	Weekly or biweekly
Dashboard –milestones % complete, known project risks	Core team and executive sponsors	Monthly
Risk mitigation	Core project team, escalated to executive sponsors if necessary	As needed

8.0   APPENDIX

- Polk County Disposition and Payments IEPD (Spring, 2012)
- Dispositions to County Attorneys IEPD, December 2012.

9.0   APPROVALS

The undersigned agree to the project parameters described above, and commit to moving forward to assessing the feasibility and timeline for this project:

Name	Role	Signature	Date
Mark Headlee	Courts Executive Sponsor		
Zetta Pilch	ICAMCP Representative		
Keith Kreiman	CJIS Executive Sponsor		
Jared Pedersen	URL PMO		